

IN THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 3. Please replace the original sheet that includes Figure 3 with the attached replacement sheet. Note that the original Figure 3 submitted was (inadvertently and improperly) a duplicate of Figure 2. The new Figure 3 is fully described in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Attachment: (1) Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed June 29, 2005. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 37, and 41 have been amended to clarify the invention scope per the telephone discussion with the Examiner of October 20, 2005. Claims 1-41 are pending in the case. Reconsideration of the present case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks.

Telephone Interview Summary

Applicant conducted a telephone interview with the Examiner of October 20, 2005, in which the cited art of Lach was compared to the features and limitations of the independent claims, and proposed amendments clarifying the claimed invention scope discussed. The Examiner agreed that the proposed amendments would distinguish over Lach and move the case forward.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-6, 9-15, 18-24, 26-27, 30-33, 35-37, and 39-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lach (U.S. Pat. No. 6,363,452, henceforth "Lach"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Amended claim 1 recites:

1. A system comprising a plurality of computing systems, the system comprising:
 - a cage having a plurality of slots, wherein each of the slots is configured to receive a computer card;
 - a plurality of computer cards, wherein each computer card comprises a respective computing system of the plurality of computing systems, wherein each computer card includes a processor and a memory for executing at least one application program, and logic operable to encode signals for transmission to a respective remote location to communicate with a respective at least one human interface device at the remote location, wherein the remote location is more than 20 feet from the cage;

a removable function module, wherein the removable function module is operable to electrically couple to the plurality of computer cards, wherein the removable function module is operable to provide additional functionality to each of the computer cards comprised in the slots of the cage.

Applicant respectfully submits that Lach nowhere teaches or suggests “a cage having a plurality of slots, wherein each of the slots is configured to receive a computer card; a plurality of computer cards, *wherein each computer card comprises a respective computing system of the plurality of computing systems, wherein each computer card includes a processor and a memory for executing at least one application program, and logic operable to encode signals for transmission to a respective remote location to communicate with a respective at least one human interface device at the remote location, wherein the remote location is more than 20 feet from the cage*”.

Lach further fails to teach “*a removable function module, wherein the removable function module is operable to electrically couple to the plurality of computer cards, wherein the removable function module is operable to provide additional functionality to each of the computer cards comprised in the slots of the cage*”.

Applicant notes that Lach only appears to disclose adapter cards inserted into a standard computer system. The adapter cards of Lach do not comprise respective computing systems, each comprising a processor and memory for executing at least one application program as recited in claim 1. As Lach states: “The adapter cards 210, 212 typically contain functionality in addition to that found on the motherboard (emphasis added) (Lach, col. 5, lines 16-18).” Lach also fails to disclose multiple computer cards as defined and claimed, each comprising a computing system with a processor and memory, as recited in Applicant’s claims. Moreover, contrary to the Examiner’s assertions, Lach’s computer chassis is not a cage as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Lach nowhere discloses a removable function module that *is operable to electrically couple to the plurality of computer cards, wherein the removable function module is operable to provide additional functionality to each of the computer cards comprised in the slots of the cage*.

Thus, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicant submits that Lach fails to teach or suggest all the features and limitations of amended claim 1, and so claim 1 and those claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited art, and are thus allowable.

Claims 11, 21, 31, 37, and 41 include similar limitations as claim 1, and so the above arguments apply with equal force to these claims. Thus, for at least the reasons provide above, claims 11, 21, 31, 37, and 41, and those claims respectively dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited art, and are thus allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests removal of the section 102 rejection of claims 1-6, 9-15, 18-24, 26-27, 30-33, 35-37, and 39-41.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 7, 16, 28, 29, 34, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lach in view of Heath et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,564,274, henceforth “Heath”).

Claims 8, 17, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lach.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Applicant respectfully submits that since the respective base claims of claims 7, 8, 16, 17, 25, 28, 29, 34, and 38 were shown above to be patentably distinct and non-obvious, their respective claims are similarly patentably distinct and non-obvious. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the section 103 rejection of claims 7, 8, 16, 17, 25, 28, 29, 34, and 38.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5602-09400/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☒ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☒ Attachment: 1 (one) replacement drawing sheet

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey C. Hood
Reg. No. 35,198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 10/4/2005 JCH/MSW